

## Safety Advisory Committee

November 18, 2011

1:30 – 3:30 PM

### Minutes

Committee Member	Representing	Present
Anderson, Erik	Materials Sciences Division	X
Bello, Madelyn	Human Resources Advisor	X
Blodgett, Paul M.	Environment, Health and Safety Division	X
Cademartori, Helen	Information Technology Division	X
Carithers, William	Physics Division	X
Christensen, John N.	Earth Sciences Division	X
Earnest, Thomas N.	Physical Biosciences Division	
Floyd, Jim	Safety Advisory Committee Chair	X
Franaszek, Stephen	Genomics Division	X
Fujikawa, Brian	Nuclear Science Division	
Lidia, Steve	Accelerator & Fusion Research Division	
Lukens Jr., Wayne W.	Chemical Sciences Division	X
Lunden, Melissa	Environmental Energy Technologies Division	X
Martin, Michael C.	Advanced Light Source Division	X
More, Anil V.	Office of the CFO Advisor	
Taylor, Scott E.	Life Sciences Division	X
Tucker, Eugene	Facilities Division	X
Thomas, Patricia M.	Safety Advisory Committee Secretary	X
Walter, Howard	Computing Sciences Directorate	
Wong, Weyland	Engineering Division	X

**Others Present:** Mike Carr, Joe Dionne, Howard Hatayama, Julie Henderson, David Kestell, Mike Kritscher, Peter Lichty, Bob Mueller, Andrew Peterson, Scott Robinson, Mike Ruggieri, Jack Salazar, Andreas Schmid, Teresa Triplett

### Comments from the Chair – Jim Floyd

- **Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) Policy** – We are anticipating a report from Marty White on the subcommittee status next month, and recommendations in January.
- **Working Alone Policy** – The policy has been signed by Dr. Alivisatos.
- **Earthquake Response** – There was a medium-size earthquake on the afternoon of the day we had our earthquake drill. The response varied. It is easy to know what to do in a very large or very small earthquake. Rocky Saunders is working on guidance for when we should evacuate. There is no official forum for collecting everyone's opinions except the quarterly emergency team/building managers' seminars.

- **ESH Peer Review** – Environmental Energy Technologies Division (EETD) will be the next to be reviewed. We will continue using Division Director participation. Steve Gourlay from the Accelerator and Fusion Research Division (AFRD) will be interviewing Ashok Gadgil. Jim Floyd and Scott Robinson are working on putting together a review team and lines of inquiry.
- **Quarterly meeting with Jim Krupnick** – Jim Krupnick will be coming to the December meeting, which will be in two weeks. We will have a closed-door discussion on the status of topics discussed in the annual meeting with the Lab Director.

### **Occurrence Reporting and Processing System (ORPS) Update – Andrew Peterson**

A new DOE Order will become effective January 1. The criteria as to which incidents are reportable and the categorization will change. For example, concussions will be reportable. Lockout/Tagout procedural violations have been downgraded to Category 4. The changes will be reflected in PUB-3000, Chapter 15 and the website. The posters will become obsolete. The Environmental Health and Safety (EHS) point of contact will shift from Jack Salazar to Andrew Peterson.

### **Radiation Controlled Area Signs – David Kestell**

The Radiation Protection Group will be changing the Controlled Area signs between December 5 and the winter shutdown. They are starting a communications and outreach program. The new General Employee Radiation Training has been released. People who routinely access Controlled Areas will be targeted for retraining.

### **Accident/Incident Investigations LEAN Initiative – Jack Salazar**

A LEAN initiative was conducted over the summer to look at the investigation of ORPS and high-risk safety events. LBNL did not have a formalized incident reporting and fact gathering process. It was taking months to conduct investigations, and the details were being forgotten by the end of the process. Division management was not being properly engaged or taking ownership of the process. Communication of Lessons Learned was not effective.

The vision of the future state includes a “hotline” for reporting incidents; an immediate, professional-quality investigation; stakeholder involvement in developing and implementing corrective actions; and communication of Lessons Learned. The time schedule for conducting investigations will be compressed. There will be more Division ownership and involvement in a scoping process, progress reports, and corrective action development. We will know the changes have been effective if we can prevent recurrence of similar accidents.

An implementation team has been put together and a schedule has been developed. Implementation is being piloted for subcontractor safety incidents. There will be communication with senior management, including Division Directors, Deputies, and Business Managers. Division Management will be expected to set the tone, prioritize, allocate resources, share Lessons Learned, and provide feedback. Howard Hatayama and Rebecca Rishell are working with the team as the management advisors.

The biggest change will be in the way high-priority ORPS are investigated. There will be a focus on engagement of the owning Division, quality assurance throughout, commitment of resources, and information gathering. About 30 people were involved in mapping the investigation process, identifying problems and solutions, and developing an implementation plan. The LEAN team will report back with more specifics as the implementation progresses. They want input from SAC. The improvement process will be ongoing – it will never be perfect. We will be keeping the existing investigators for now.

### **Accident/Incident Investigations – Discussion of Scope of SAC Efforts – Jim Floyd**

SAC's efforts must be useful, not redundant with what the LEAN team is doing. We want to be able to demonstrate to Dr. Alivisatos that the investigation process has improved. Jim Floyd reviewed the proposal that was distributed to Committee Members prior to the meeting. The proposal may evolve into a statement that will go into investigation instructions. Dr. Alivisatos will be asked to socialize it with the Division Directors. The charter for each Root Cause Analysis investigation should come from Dr. Alivisatos. The Office of Contractor Assurance and Division Directors will work together to set-up investigation teams. There will be orientation and refresher training for investigators where necessary. SAC will take a longer view of whether the investigation process is working. The Division Representative of each Division experiencing a major incident should report to SAC on their experience with the investigation. SAC will look at the overall process and provide feedback to Dr. Alivisatos on the long-term effectiveness of the process and whether useful Lessons Learned are being communicated and implemented. Where the inquiry leads will depend on where SAC sees issues. SAC will look at whether investigations are identifying core issues.

There was a question about whether Human Performance Improvement (HPI) is being utilized in the current program. HPI principals have been integrated into the issues management manual, causal analysis, and the supervisors' safety class. HPI has also been incorporated in the accountability statement at the Advanced Light Source. The integration has been somewhat stealthy – people are not told they are using HPI. Howard Hatayama asked whether HPI should be brought out more explicitly. The Department of Energy has an HPI manual and training. There were questions about the costs, benefits, and requirements of

getting more involved with HPI. The concept of a “just culture” is HPI in its broadest application. HPI informs the concepts of Integrated Safety Management. SAC needs more information. There is potentially a lot of value. Howard Hatayama can provide further resources and information.

### **Division Priorities Discussion**

Jim Floyd asked Jack Salazar what EHS would like SAC to do. Jack Salazar described EHS priorities for the next year:

- Improving customer service;
- Increasing efficiency by focusing on what is most important to preventing accidents;
- Integrating EHS into project planning.

Life Sciences is interested in improving communication of new policies. Accidents drive compliance for vendors, because they do not want to attract enforcement attention, but LBNL always has regulatory oversight.

Chemical Sciences would like safety policies to focus on customer needs. LBNL policies tend to be compliance-oriented.

Information Technology would like to focus on efficiency. Some safety procedures cause delays, and they do not always enhance safety. Our response to some issues, such as penetration permits, can be over-the-top. Other issues that are more important to safety, such as ensuring safe use of GEM vehicles, have been neglected. They noticed a problem recently with GEM doors popping open when several people are in the vehicles. The GEM custodians are being trained, but sometimes the other drivers are not trained. They would like to see Lessons Learned incorporated into training.

Advanced Light Source would like policies to be prioritized by the potential severity of consequences. They would like to see LBNL develop a more collaborative culture with teamwork across Divisions/groups. They have noticed more problems arise whenever people are isolated in space or time.

Facilities would like to see improvements in the way changes in training requirements are rolled out. Training is a big investment for them.

Engineering would like to see improvements in communication of new policies. There have been delays in implementation of some new policies because Divisions do not understand what they are expected to do.

Materials Sciences is also concerned with improving efficiency, and avoiding unintended consequences of new policies.

Nuclear Sciences would like to see improvements in the PPE policy and the way Radioactive Materials Areas are posted.

AFRD would also like to see improvements in the PPE policy. They also want to work on improvements in recognition programs for safe behavior.

Julie Henderson said that Department of Energy (DOE) Berkeley Site Office is working on issues of risk management and risk perception. They are trying to balance DOE headquarters and LBNL viewpoints.

Genomics Division would like to see more communication of safety expectations from the top. They would also like to see more consideration of how new policies affect off-site facilities.

Earth Sciences is interested in improving training and orientation for new people. They are also interested in prioritizing safety over just compliance.

Jim Floyd summarized the Division priority themes we are hearing most often as efficiency, compliance vs. safety, communication, and customer service.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 PM  
Respectfully submitted, Patricia M. Thomas, SAC Secretary